arXiv:1405.3251v2 [math.DS] 22 Aug 2015

Duck factory on the two-torus: multiple canard cycles without geometric constraints

Ilya Schurov*† and Nikita Solodovnikov*‡

Abstract

Slow-fast systems on the two-torus are studied. As it was shown before, canard cycles are generic in such systems, which is in drastic contrast with the planar case. It is known that if the rotation number of the Poincaré map is integer and the slow curve is connected, the number of canard limit cycles is bounded from above by the number of fold points of the slow curve. In the present paper it is proved that there are no such geometric constraints for non-integer rotation numbers: it is possible to construct generic system with "as simple as possible" slow curve and arbitrary many limit cycles.

1 Introduction

Consider a generic slow-fast system on the two-dimensional torus

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, \varepsilon) \\ \dot{y} = \varepsilon g(x, y, \varepsilon) \end{cases} \qquad (x, y) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^2/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}^2), \quad \varepsilon \in (\mathbb{R}_+, 0) \qquad (1)$$

Assume that f and g are smooth enough and $g > 0$. The dynamics of this system is guided by the *slow curve*:

$$M = \{(x, y) \mid f(x, y, 0) = 0\}.$$

It consists of equilibrium points of the fast motion (i.e. motion determined by system (1) for $\varepsilon = 0$). Particularly, one can consider two parts of the slow curve: one is stable (consists of attracting hyperbolic equilibrium points) and the other is unstable (consists of repelling hyperbolic equlibrium points). On the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$, there is rather simple description of the generic trajectory of (1): it consists of interchanging phases of slow motion along stable parts of the slow curve and fast jumps along straight lines $y = const$ near the folds of the slow curve [6]. On the two-torus, more complicated behaviour can be locally generic.

Definition 1. A solution (or trajectory) is called *canard* if it contains an arc of length bounded away from zero uniformly in ε that keeps close to the unstable

*Higher School of Economics

†The present paper uses results obtained under the support of the project No 12-01-0227 "Dynamics of Josephson junction and slow-fast systems on the two-torus" within the program "The HSE scientific foundation" in 2013/2014

‡Supported by project MK-7567.2013.1

part of the slow curve and simultaniously contains an arc (also of length bounded away from zero uniformly in ε) that keeps close to the stable part of the slow curve.

This definition is a bit informal, more rigorous one will be given in section 2 (see Definition 4). Canards are not generic on the plane: one have to introduce an additional parameter to get an attracting canard cycle. (See e.g. [7].) However, they are generic on the two-torus, as was conjectured in [1] and strictly proved in [2].

Let us explain this phenomena briefly. Assume that there exists global cross-section $\Gamma = \{y = const\}$ transversal to the field. Then one can define the Poincaré map $P_\varepsilon \colon \Gamma \to \Gamma$. It is a diffeomorphism of a circle. The rotation number $\rho(\varepsilon)$ of the map P_ε continuously depends on ε. For generic system (1) function $\rho(\varepsilon)$ is a Cantor function (also known as devil's staircase) whose horizontal steps occur at rational values which (in the general case) corresponds to the existence of hyperbolic periodic points of the map P_ε. These in turn corresponds to limit cycles of the original vector field. More precisely, if the Poincaré map has a rotation number with a denominator n then the initial vector field has a limit cycle which makes n full passes along the slow direction of the torus y. In particular, fixed points of the Poincaré map correspond to limit cycles which make only one round along the slow direction of the torus.

While hyperbolic limit cycles present, the rotation number is preserved under small perturbations. So when the rotation number increases, the limit cycles have to bifurcate through saddle-node (parabolic) bifurcation. Near the critical value of the parameter, the derivative of the Poincare map for both colliding cycles have to be close to 1. This is possible only if the cycles spend comparable time near the stable and the unstable parts of the slow curve, and thus they are canards.

The next natural question is to provide an estimate for the number of canard cycles that can born in a generic slow-fast system on the two-torus. The answer to this question for the case of integer rotation number and a rather wide class of systems was given in [3].

Theorem 1. *For generic slow-fast system on the two-torus with contractible nondegenerate connected slow curve the number of limit cycles that make one pass along the axis of slow motion is bounded by the number of fold points of the slow curve. This estimate is sharp in some open set in the space of slow-fast systems on the two-torus.*

In the present paper we consider the case of non-integer rotation number that is not covered by Theorem 1. We also conjecture that our arguments can be applied to systems with unconnected slow curves (see section 6). The latter case is of special interest because slow-fast systems with unconnected slow curve appear naturally in physical applications, e.g. in the modelling of circuits with Josephson junction [5].

Our main result state that in contrast with Theorem 1 for non-integer rotation number there are *no geometric constraints* on the number of (canard) limit cycles. Particularly, for any desired odd number of limit cycles l we construct open set in the space of the slow-fast systems on the two-torus with *convex* slow curve (i.e. having only two fold points) with exactly l canard cycles that make two passes along the axis of slow motion. (The corresponding Poincaré map has half-integer rotation number.) See Theorem A.

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to Yu. S. Ilyashenko, John Guckenheimer, Victor Kleptsyn and Alexey Klimenko for fruitful discussions and valuable comments.

2 Main results

In this section we state our main results. We are interested only in the phase curves of system (1), so one can divide it by g and consider without loss of generality case of $g \equiv 1$.

Definition 2. Slow curve M is called *simple* if it is smooth and connected, its lift to the covering coordinate plane is contained in the interior of the fundamental square $\{|x| < \pi,\ |y| < \pi\}$ and is convex.

We will only consider simple slow curves. This, in particular, implies that there are two jump points (forward and backward jumps), which are the far right and the far left points of M (see Figure 1; here and below we will assume that fast coordinate x is vertical and slow coordinate y is horizontal). We denote them G^- and G^+ respectively. We assume without loss of generality that $G^\pm = (0, \mp 1)$. (Here and below every equation with $\pm$'s and $\mp$'s corresponds to a couple of equations: with all top and all bottom signs.) This can be achieved by appropriate change of coordinates respecting fibration $\{y = const\}$.

Definition 3. Simple slow curve M is called *nondegenerate* if and only if

1. The following nondegenericity assumption holds in every point $(x, y) \in M \setminus \{G^+, G^-\}$:
$$\frac{\partial f(x, y, 0)}{\partial x} \neq 0. \tag{2}$$
2. The following nondegenericity assumptions hold in the jump points:
$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 f(x, y, 0)}{\partial x^2}\right|_{G^\pm} \neq 0, \quad \left.\frac{\partial f(x, y, 0)}{\partial y}\right|_{G^\pm} \neq 0 \tag{3}$$

Definition 4. Fix some small $\delta > 0$ (to be chosen later). Denote by I_δ the segment $I_\delta = [-1 + \delta, 1 - \delta] =: [\widetilde{\alpha}^-, \widetilde{\alpha}^+]$. Denote also the segments

$$\Sigma^- = \{(0, y) \mid y \in I_\delta\},$$

and

$$\Sigma^+ = \{(\pi, y) \mid y \in I_\delta\}.$$

Every trajectory that cross either of these two segments will be called *canard*.

This definition of canard differs from those used in [1, 2, 3]. Our definition is stricter than the former and is more classical: the trajectory that pass almost no time near the stable part of the slow curve is not canard according to our definition.

Now we are ready to state the main result.

Theorem A. *For every desired odd number of limit cycles $l \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$ there exists an open set in the space of slow-fast systems on the two-torus with the following properties.*

1. *Slow curve M is simple and nondegenerate.*

2. *For every system from this set there exists a sequence of intervals $\{R_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subset \{\varepsilon > 0\}$, accumulating at zero, such that for every $\varepsilon \in R_n$ there exist exactly l canard limit cycles.*

Remark 1. One can construct the desired example for any prescribed simple nondegenerate slow curve. Moreover, the requirement of convexity can be easily replaced with the less restrictive requirement: M has only two fold points. This can be achieved by smooth coordinate change preserving fibration $\{y = const\}$.

Remark 2. No upper estimate on the number of non-canard limit cycles is given. At least one non-canard cycle exists in our settings.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 3 we discuss the settings and give a heuristic proof of the main result. In section 4 we construct a family with the desired properties relying on two technical lemmas about the asymptotics of some Poincaré map. In section 5 we prove the technical lemmas. In section 6 we state a conjecture on slow-fast systems on the two-torus with unconnected slow curves.

3 The vertical Poincaré map: heuristic proof

In this section we provide the proof of the main result on the heuristic level: only main ideas are highlighted and all the technical details are postponed to the rest of the paper. We investigate the "vertical" Poincaré map Q_ε from the segment Σ^- to itself (see Definition 4; the complete settings are given in section 3.1). When some special requirements satisfied, this map can be approximated by some simple function. We provide necesary preliminary results in section 3.2 and describe the approximation in section 3.3. Then we give the outline of the proof of Theorem A (see section 3.4).

3.1 Settings and notations

Let M be a slow curve. It consists of stable (M^-) and unstable (M^+) parts and two jump points: the forward jump point G^- and the backward jump point G^+, see Figure 1:

$$M = M^+ \sqcup \{G^+\} \sqcup M^- \sqcup \{G^-\}.$$

Recall that $G^\pm = (0, \mp 1)$. We will also use the notation $M^\pm(y)$ assuming that $M^\pm$ here are functions, whose graph $x = M^\pm(y)$ defines unstable and stable parts of the slow curve.

Call $\Pi = S^1 \times I_\delta$ a *basic strip*, where I_δ is the same as in Definition 4

Fix a vertical segment J^+ (resp., J^-) which intersects M^+ (M^-) close enough to the jump point G^- (G^+), and does not intersect M^- (M^+). Let

$$y(J^\pm) =: \alpha^\pm = \pm 1 \mp \delta^\pm,$$

where $\delta^\pm$ are small and $\delta^\pm < \delta$ (here δ is the same as in Definition 4). Note that the definition of $J^\pm$ differs from one in [1, 2]: instead of placing J^+ near G^+ we place it near G^- and do opposite with J^-.



Figure 1: The slow curve and jump points. Note that horizontal axis is y and vertical is x

We have to reproduce the notation on oriented arcs on a circle and Poincaré maps from [2]. Consider arbitrary points a and b on the oriented circle S^1. They split the circle into two arcs. Denote the arc from point a to point b (in the sense of the orientation of the circle) by $[a, b\rangle$. The orientation of this arc is induced by the orientation of the circle. Also denote the same arc with the reversed orientation by $\langle a, b]$ (see Figure 2).

Denote also the Poincaré map along the phase curves of the main system (1) from the cross-section $y = a$ to the cross-section $y = b$ in the forward time by $P_\varepsilon^{[a,b\rangle}$. Also, let $P_\varepsilon^{\langle a,b]} = (P_\varepsilon^{[a,b\rangle})^{-1}$: this is the Poincaré map from the cross-section $y = b$ to the cross-section $y = a$ in the backward time. This fact is stressed by the notation: the direction of the angle bracket shows the time direction.

3.2 Preliminary results

Denote

$$D_\varepsilon^+ := P_\varepsilon^{\langle -\pi,\alpha^+]}(J^+), \quad D_\varepsilon^- = P_\varepsilon^{[\alpha^-,\pi\rangle}(J^-)$$

It is proved in [1, 2] (see the Shape Lemmas there) that $|D_\varepsilon^\pm| = O(e^{-C/\varepsilon})$. Note that as ε decrease to 0, D_ε^+ moves downward and D_ε^- moves upward, making



Figure 2: Orientation of the arcs

infinitely many rotations (see the Monotonicity Lemmas in [1, 2]) and meet each other infinitely many times. The values of ε for which D_ε^+ and D_ε^- have nonempty intersection forms intervals R_n:

$$\{R_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} = \{\varepsilon > 0 \colon D_\varepsilon^+ \cap D_\varepsilon^- \neq \varnothing\}.$$

As it was shown in [1, 2], intervals R_n has exponentially small length and accumulate at zero. If one pick any sequence $\varepsilon_n \in R_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, then

$$\varepsilon_n = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Let $\varepsilon \in R_n$ and pick some point $q \in D_\varepsilon^+ \cap D_\varepsilon^-$. Consider the trajectory through q. In the forward time, this trajectory makes several (about $O(1/\varepsilon)$) rotations, then performs backward jump, follows unstable part of the slow curve M^+ and finally intersects J^+. In the backward time, this trajectory (again after several rotations) passes near the stable part of the slow curve M^- and finally intersects J^-. We will call this trajectory *grand canard* despite the fact that this is not a canard according to Definition 4.

Let U be a segment of the stable or unstable part of the slow curve M. Introduce the notation:

$$\Phi(U) = \int_U f'_x dy. \tag{4}$$

Denote also for brevity

$$\Phi^{\pm}[y_1, y_2\rangle := \Phi(U),$$

where U is an arc of $M^{\pm}$ projected on $[y_1, y_2\rangle$.

Function Φ describes the expansion (if positive) or contraction (if negative) accumulated while passing near the corresponding arc of the slow curve. Formally, the following theorem holds:

Theorem 2 (See [1])**.** *Let $U = [A, B] \subset M^{\pm}$ and $X = [x_1, x_2] \times \{y(A)\}$ be a segment that contains A and do not cross M in points different from A. Then*

$$\log\left(P_\varepsilon^{[y(A),y(B)\rangle}(x)\right)'\Big|_X = \frac{\Phi(U) + O(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, similar (but a little weaker) estimate holds for trajectories extended through the jump point even after they make $O(1/\varepsilon)$ rotations along the x-axis after the jump. The exact statement follows.

Theorem 3 (See [2, 3]). *Let $U = [A, G^-] \subset M^- \cup \{G^-\}$, X as in previous Theorem and y_1 is a point outside of the projection of M to y-axis, such that there is no other points of that projection on arc $[1, y_1\rangle$. Than the following holds:*

$$\log \left(P_\varepsilon^{[y(A), y_1\rangle}(x) \right)' \Big|_X = \frac{\Phi(U) + O(\varepsilon^\nu)}{\varepsilon},$$

where $\nu \in (0, 1/4]$.

Reverting the time, one can obtain a similar result for M^+ and G^+.

3.3 Approximation of the Poincaré map

Definition 5. Choose arbitrary $y \in I_\delta$ and assume that $|\Phi^-[y, 1\rangle| < \Phi^+[-1, 1\rangle$. Then due to the nondegenericity assumptions (2) there exists unique *singular release point* $\beta = \beta(y) \in [-1, 1\rangle$ such that

$$\Phi^-[y, 1\rangle + \Phi^+[-1, \beta(y)\rangle = 0. \tag{5}$$

Lemma 1. *Let $\varepsilon \in R_n$ for some n and therefore there exists grand canard. Then the Poincaré map $Q_\varepsilon \colon \Sigma^- \to \Sigma^-$ can be decomposed in the following way:*

$$\Sigma^- \overset{Q_\varepsilon^-}{\to} \Sigma^+ \overset{Q_\varepsilon^+}{\to} \Sigma^-,$$

and maps Q_ε^+ and Q_ε^- both have the following asymptotics:

$$Q_\varepsilon^\pm(y) = \beta(y) + O(\varepsilon^\nu) \tag{6}$$

for some $\nu \in (0, 1/4)$. The Poincaré map Q_ε is defined at the point y for small ε if and only if $\beta(y)$ and $\beta(\beta(y))$ are defined and contained in the interior of I_δ.

Heuristic proof of Lemma 1. Consider the map Q_ε^- (the map Q_ε^+ can be considered in the same way). Let $p = (0, y_0) \in \Sigma^-$ and therefore p is bounded away from M. Consider a trajectory ψ through p. In the forward time, it attracts to M^- after time $O(1)$ ("falls") in the negative direction ("downwards"), see Figure 1. After the fall, the trajectory follows M^- exponentially close to the grand canard (being "above" the grand canard) until the jump point. It follows from Theorem 3 that after the jump the distance between the trajectory ψ and the grand canard is exponentially small and its log is approximately $\varepsilon^{-1}\Phi^-[y_0, 1\rangle < 0$.

After the jump, the trajectory follows grand canard during the rotation phase, then performs backward jump and passes near some segment of the unstable part of the slow curve M^+. It is possible that the trajectory will be released from the grand canard (and thus M^+) at some point and then attracted to M^- again before leaving the basic strip. This release will be made in the positive direction ("upward"), because the trajectory ψ is above the grand canard. In this case the trajectory intersects Σ^+ and therefore $Q_\varepsilon^-(y_0)$ is defined.

We will show that the release is possible only near $\beta(y_0)$. Indeed, the release occurs at the point where the contraction rate accumulated during the passage

near the stable part of the slow curve is compensated by the expansion accumulated near the unstable part of the curve. The latter is exponentially large and its log is approximately $\varepsilon^{-1}\Phi^+[-1, \beta(y_0)\rangle > 0$.

Relation (5) says that $\beta(y_0)$ is the point for which the contraction is compensated by the expansion. Thus the value of the Poincaré map $Q_\varepsilon^-(y_0)$ is approximately equal to $\beta(y_0)$. The error of all calculations is of order $O(\varepsilon^\nu)$ as in Theorem 3.

Rigorous proof will be given in section 5.1. □

3.4 The outline of the proof of the Main Result

Lemma 1 allows one to control the image $Q_\varepsilon(y_0)$ of some point y_0 controlling the value of the integrals Φ^+ and Φ^- over the appropriate arcs of the slow curve: making them larger or smaller (relatively to each other) one can shift the image $Q_\varepsilon(y_0)$ to the left or to the right. Using this idea one can impose finite number of inequalities on the values of the integrals that guarantee the existence of several trapping segments for the Poincaré map Q_ε or its inverse with fixed points inside each of them, see Lemma 2. Moreover, one can show that the derivative of Q_ε can also be approximated by the derivative of an "ideal" Poincaré map $\beta \circ \beta$, see section 5.2. This allows one to make the Poincaré map or its inverse *contracting* on the trapping intervals and thereofure guarantee that every such interval contains exactly one fixed point, see Lemma 3.

All the conditions imposed during the construction are open (strict inequalities) and therefore one have an open set in the space of slow-fast systems with the desired properties. This completes the heuristic proof of the main result. In the following section we give all the details needed.

4 Construction of the family

In this section we construct a family (1) with the desired number of two-pass limit cycles. Lemma 2 constructs a function f in (1) and estimates the number of the closed trajectories from below. Lemma 3 proves that all constructed closed trajectories are hyperbolic limit cycles with known stability type and there is no other canard cycles except constructed ones.

Thus constructed family (1) satisfies both assertions of Theorem A. During the contruction we only imply the finite number of strict inequalities on the function f defining the family. Therefore we obtain an open set of such families in the space of all slow-fast systems on the two-torus. Thus Theorem A will be proved.

As the dynamics is governed mostly by the values of integrals $\Phi^\pm$ of the derivative f'_x over the segments of the slow curve, denote for brevity $\lambda^\pm(y) := f'_x|_{M^\pm}(y)$.

4.1 Lower estimate

Lemma 2. *For any given $2n+1$ segments $\omega_i^a = [a_{2i-1}, a_{2i}]$, $\omega_i^b = [b_{2i}, b_{2i-1}]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\omega_{n+1}^a = [a_{2n+1}, b_{2n+1}]$ such that*

$$-1 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3 \dots < a_{2n+1} < b_{2n+1} < \dots < b_1 < 1$$

there exists smooth function $f\colon \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ *system* (1) *with given* f *and* $g \equiv 1$ *satisfies the following properties:*

1. *For every* $i = 1, \dots, n$ *there exist at least two closed trajectories: the first one intersects* $\{\pi\} \times \omega_i^a$ *and* $\{0\} \times \omega_i^b$ *and the second one intersects* $\{0\} \times \omega_i^a$ *and* $\{\pi\} \times \omega_i^b$ *respectively.*
2. *At least one closed trajectory intersects segments* $\{0, \pi\} \times \omega_{n+1}^a$.
3. *No closed trajectories intersect*
$$\{0, \pi\} \times \left([a_0, b_0] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{n} (\omega_i^a \cup \omega_i^b) \cup \omega_{n+1}^a \right) \right)$$
4. *Derivative* $\lambda^{\pm}$ *is constant on the segments* ω_i^a, ω_i^b, $i = 1, \dots, n$ *and* ω_{n+1}^a *and is monotonic between them.*

Proof of Lemma 2. Denote $a_{-1} = -1$. Fix arbitrary points a_0, b_0, b_{-1}, such that $-1 < a_0 < a_1$, $b_1 < b_0 < b_{-1} < 1$. Denote for unity

$$b_{2n+2} = a_{2n+1},\ a_{2n+2} = b_{2n+1},\ a_{2n+3} = b_{2n},\ \omega_{n+1}^b = \omega_{n+1}^a. \tag{7}$$

So indexes from -1 to $2n+3$ are in use.

Proposition 1. *Consider inclusions for* $i = 1, \dots, n+1$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For odd } i\text{: } \beta([a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}]) &\Subset \omega_i^b, \\ \beta([b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}]) &\Subset \omega_i^a, \\ \text{For even } i\text{: } [a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}] &\Subset \beta(\omega_i^b), \\ [b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}] &\Subset \beta(\omega_i^a). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Notation $A \Subset B$ *here means that the closure of* A *is a subset of the interior of* B. *Inclusions* (8) *implies the first three assertions of Lemma 2.*

Proof of Proposition 1. Due to notation $a_{2n+2} = b_{2n+1}$ $a_{2n+3} = b_{2n}$, segment ω_{n+1}^a can be rewritten as $[a_{2n+1}, a_{2n+2}]$ or as $[b_{2n+2}, b_{2n+1}]$. Note that due to conventions (7) inclusions provided by (8) coincides for $i = n+1$.

Recall that β doesn't depend on ε. Due to (6) there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ inclusions (8) hold for $Q_\varepsilon^{\pm}$ instead of β. Recall that $Q_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon^+ \circ Q_\varepsilon^-$. Therefore for odd i the following inclusions take place:

$$Q_\varepsilon\left([a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}]\right) \Subset \omega_i^a,\ Q_\varepsilon([b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}]) \Subset \omega_i^b,$$

and for the even i

$$[a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}] \Subset Q_\varepsilon(\omega_i^a),\ [b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}] \Subset Q_\varepsilon(\omega_i^b).$$

For any i the following inclusions take place:

$$\omega_i^a \Subset [a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}],\ \omega_i^b \Subset [b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}],$$

Hence there exists at least one fixed point of the map Q_ε in each of the segments ω_i^a for $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, in ω_i^b for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, no fixed points belong to

segments $[a_{2i}, a_{2i+1}]$, $[b_{2i+1}, b_{2i}]$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$. Any fixed point of the Poincaré map Q_ε corresponds to the closed trajectory. This implies the first and the third assertions of Lemma 2. Note that due to notation $[a_{2n+1}, a_{2n+2}] = [b_{2n+2}, b_{2n+1}]$ second assertion of Lemma 2 is also proved (see inclusions for $i = n+1$ and segment ω^a_{n+1}). □

Now consider the following systems of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for odd } i = 1, 3 \dots, n+1: \\ &\qquad |\Phi^+[-1, b_{2i}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[a_{2i+1}, a_{2i+2}\rangle|, \\ &\qquad |\Phi^+[-1, a_{2i-1}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[b_{2i-2}, b_{2i-3}\rangle|, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for even } i = 0, 2, 4 \dots, n+1: \\ &\qquad |\Phi^-[a_{2i}, 1\rangle| < |\Phi^+[b_{2i+2}, b_{2i+1}\rangle|, \\ &\qquad |\Phi^-[b_{2i-1}, 1\rangle| < |\Phi^+[a_{2i-3}, a_{2i-2}\rangle|. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Skip inequality that contains any index out of range $[-1, 2n+2]$.

Proposition 2. *Inequalities* (9), (10) *imply inclusions* (8).

Proof of Proposition 2. Indeed, $[a_{2i+1}, a_{2i+2}] \subset [a_{2i+1}, 1]$ and $[b_{2i+2}, b_{2i+1}] \subset [-1, b_{2i+1}]$ and therefore the first inequalities in the systems (9), (10) imply:

$$\text{for odd } i\text{: } |\Phi^+[-1, b_{2i}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[a_{2i+1}, a_{2i+2}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[a_{2i+1}, 1\rangle|, \tag{11}$$

$$\text{for even } i\text{: } |\Phi^-[a_{2i}, 1\rangle| < |\Phi^+[b_{2i+2}, b_{2i+1}\rangle| < |\Phi^+[-1, b_{2i+1}\rangle|. \tag{12}$$

And the last inequalities in the systems (9) and (10) imply:

$$\text{for odd } i\text{: } |\Phi^+[-1, a_{2i-1}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[b_{2i-2}, b_{2i-3}\rangle| < |\Phi^-[b_{2i-2}, 1\rangle|, \tag{13}$$

$$\text{for even } i\text{: } |\Phi^-[b_{2i-1}, 1\rangle| < |\Phi^+[a_{2i-3}, a_{2i-2}\rangle| < |\Phi^+[-1, a_{2i-2}\rangle|. \tag{14}$$

Consider an odd index i. Due to (5), $|\Phi^-[y, 1\rangle| = \Phi^+[-1, \beta(y)\rangle$. Rewrite inequalities (11), (12), (13), (14) appropriately with $[-1, \beta(y)\rangle$ instead of $[y, 1\rangle$ and substitute odd index i into (11), even index $i-1$ to (12), odd index i into (13), even index $i+1$ into (14). We get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^+[-1, b_{2i}\rangle| &< |\Phi^+[-1, \beta(a_{2i+1})\rangle|, \\ |\Phi^+[-1, \beta(a_{2i-2})\rangle| &< |\Phi^+[-1, b_{2i-1}\rangle|, \\ |\Phi^+[-1, a_{2i-1}\rangle| &< |\Phi^+[-1, \beta(b_{2i-2})\rangle|, \\ |\Phi^+[-1, \beta(b_{2i+1})\rangle| &< |\Phi^+[-1, a_{2i}\rangle|. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Function Φ^+ monotonically depends on the right boundary of the given segment. Therefore system (15) implies the desired inclusions for odd i:

$$\begin{aligned} &b_{2i} < \beta(a_{2i+1}),\ \beta(a_{2i-2}) < b_{2i-1},\ \beta([a_{2i-2}, a_{2i+1}]) \Subset \omega^b_i, \\ &a_{2i-1} < \beta(b_{2i-2}),\ \beta(b_{2i+1}) < a_{2i},\ \beta([b_{2i+1}, b_{2i-2}]) \Subset \omega^a_i, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Drawing the conclusion for the even index i repeats literally. One should substitute odd index $i-1$ to (11), even index i into (12), odd index $i+1$ into (13), even index i into (14). □

Proposition 3. *There exists smooth function $f\colon \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies inequalities* (9), (10) *and the forth assertion of Lemma 2.*

Proof of the Proposition 3. Below we construct the desired function f. We consequently define values of its derivative for some arcs of $M^{\pm}$. Then we extend it smoothly to the whole torus. Trivial Proposition 4 below describes the main tool of the construction.

Proposition 4. *For any segment $[A, B] \subset (-1, 1)$, any large constant $I > 0$ and any small $\Delta > 0$ there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and a function λ defined in the neighbourhood of the segment $[A, B]$ such that $\lambda|_{[A,B]}$ is constant and the following two properties hold for any positive $\delta < \delta_0$:*

$$\left| \int_A^B \lambda(y)dy \right| > I,$$

$$\left| \left(\int_{A-\delta/2}^{A} + \int_{B}^{B+\delta/2} \right) \lambda \right| < \Delta.$$

Proof of Proposition 4. Put $|\lambda||_{[A,B]} = \frac{I+1}{|[A,B]|}$, and $\delta_0 = \frac{|[A,B]|\cdot\Delta}{I+1}$. Put also

$$|\lambda||_{[A-\delta,A-\delta/2]} = |\lambda||_{[B+\delta/2,B+\delta]} = 2$$

and take λ smooth and monotonic in the rest two segments $[A-\delta/2, A]$, $[B, B+\delta/2]$. See Figure 3. Direct calculations prove the proposition immediately.



Figure 3: Bump function: $S_1 + S_2 < \Delta$.

□

Now proceed with the construction of $\lambda^{\pm}$. First of all put $\lambda^{\pm}$ to be equal ± 2 in some neighborhood of the segment $[a_0, b_{-1}]$. On the other segments $[-1, a_0]$, $[b_{-1}, 1]$ put it monotonic and smooth enough (except the jump points) such that at the jump points $\lambda^+ = \lambda^- = f'_x = 0$, $f''_x \neq 0$ and f can be extended to the whole torus. Satisfy inequalities (9), (10) in two phases, redefining the derivative $\lambda^{\pm}$ in some subsegments of $(-1, 1)$, see Figure 4.

During the first phase satisfyby induction the *last* inequalities in (9) and (10) for $i = 1, \ldots, n + 1$.



Figure 4: Choice of the segments in the first part of the inductive proof of Proposition 3. For $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ we choose two segments of the different parts of the slow curve (one is bold on the figure and the other is thin) and consequently put large values of the derivative $\lambda^{\pm}$ on the bold segment in such a way that the integral $\Phi^{\pm}$ over this segment is greater by absolute value than the integral over the corresponding thin segment. Every step does not affect the previous ones. On the figure first five steps of inductive proof are shown.

Base of induction: $i = 1$, inequality $\Phi^+[-1, a_1\rangle < |\Phi^-[b_0, b_{-1}\rangle|$ is desired. The second inequality of (10) does not exist for $i = 0$ due to index constraints. Redefine the value of λ^- in the neighborhood of the segment $[b_0, b_{-1}]$: apply Proposition 4 to that segment, put $I = \Phi^+[-1, a_1\rangle$ and take any small Δ.

Step of induction. Let the last inequalities in (9) and (10) are satisfied for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Satisfy them for $i = k$.

Let k be even. Inequality $|\Phi^-[b_{2k-1}, 1\rangle| < \Phi^+[a_{2k-3}, a_{2k-2}\rangle$ is desired. Value of its left-hand side is defined by the initial definition $(f^-)'_x = -2$ and by the previous steps of induction (for the even $i = k-1, k-3, \dots$). Now apply Proposition 4 to the function λ^+, segment $\omega^a_{k-1} = [a_{2k-3}, a_{2k-2}]$, $I = |\Phi^-[b_{2k-1}, 1\rangle|$ and some Δ (choose it later). Thus current inequality is satisfied. Check that inequalities satisfied on the previous steps of induction are preserved.

Any change of the derivative $\lambda^{\pm}$ in $\delta(\Delta)$-neighborhood of the segment ω^a_{k-1} has no influence on the inequalities for $i = 1, \dots, k-2$. Consider $i = k-1$. We change the derivative at the segment $[a_{2k-3} - \delta, a_{2k-3}]$ which is a subsegment of $[1, a_{2k-3}]$. Integral $\Phi^-[1, a_{2k-3}\rangle$ stays in the right-hand side of the second inequality in (9) for odd $i = k-1$. We change its value no more than at Δ. Inequality for $i = k-1$ is strict, therefore there exists sufficiently small $\Delta = \Delta(i)$ such that inequality for $i = k-1$ is also preserved.

Let k be odd. Apply Proposition 4 to the function λ^-, segment $\omega^b_{k-1} = [b_{2k-2}, b_{2k-3}]$, $I = \Phi^+[-1, a_{2k-1}\rangle$ and (as in previous case) sufficiently small Δ. Step of induction is over.

During the second phase satisfy the *first* inequalities in (9) and (10).

This can be done in a similar way. Now consequently decrease index $i = n, \dots, 1, 0$. For the odd index i apply Proposition 4 to the function λ^-, the

segment $\omega^a_{i+1} = [a_{2i+1}, a_{2i+2}]$ and $I = \Phi^+[-1, b_{2i}\rangle$. For the even index i apply Proposition 4 to the function λ^+, the segment $\omega^b_{i+1} = [b_{2i+2}, b_{2i+1}]$ and $I = |\Phi^-[a_{2i}, 1\rangle|$.

So the inequalities are satisfied and derivative f'_x is defined all over the M. By construction $\lambda^\pm$ is a constant on the chosen segments and forth assertion of Lemma 4 is also satisfied. □

Due to Proposition 2 and Proposition 1 function f constructed above satisfies all assertions of Lemma 2. □

4.2 Sharp estimate

Lemma 2 constructs system (1) with some closed trajectories. Below we prove that every closed trajectory is a limit cycle. We also prove that there are no canard limit cycles other that constructed. To this end we estimate the derivative of the Poncaré map Q_ε and show that it (or its inverse) is strictly contracting on the segments where fixed points are located.

Lemma 3. *For every $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists exactly two limit cycles: the first one intersects segments $\{0\} \times \omega^a_i$ and $\{\pi\} \times \omega^b_i$, the second one intersects $\{\pi\} \times \omega^a_i$ and $\{0\} \times \omega^b_i$. For $i = n+1$ there exists one limit cycle which intersects $\{0\} \times \omega^a_{n+1}$ and $\{\pi\} \times \omega^a_{n+1}$.*

Proof of Lemma 3. Due to inclusions (8) and approximation (6) if for some $i = 1, \dots, n$ a closed trajectory intersects one of the segments $\{0, \pi\} \times \omega^a_i$ then it also intersects one of $\{\pi, 0\} \times \omega^b_i$ respectively; for $i = n+1$ a closed trajectory intersects both segments $\{0, \pi\} \times \omega^a_{n+1}$. The following Lemma 4 estimates the derivative of the Poincaré map Q_ε in these segments.

Lemma 4. *There exists constants c^a_i, c^b_i such that the following estimates take place:*

$$(Q_\varepsilon)'|_{\omega^a_i} = c^a_i \cdot (1 + o(1)),\ i = 1, \dots, n+1$$

$$(Q_\varepsilon)'|_{\omega^b_i} = c^b_i \cdot (1 + o(1)),\ i = 1, \dots, n$$

We prove Lemma 4 later: see section 5.2.

Consider some fixed point y_0 of the map Q_ε that corresponds to some closed trajectory. Due to Lemma 4 the derivative Q'_ε tends to some constant in the neighborhood of y_0 as ε tends to zero. Due to Lemma 1 the following approximation takes place: $Q_\varepsilon = \beta \circ \beta + O(\varepsilon^\nu)$. Map β has no dependence on ε. If for some segment σ from the set

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \{\omega^a_i, \omega^b_i\} \cup \omega^a_{n+1}$$

one of the corresponding transversal segments $\{0, \pi\} \times \sigma$ intersects closed trajectory, then by construction (see inclusions (8)) map $\beta \circ \beta$ sends the corresponding segment *strictly* into or onto itself. So for such segments the derivative Q_ε does not tend to 1 and is bounded away from 1 for sufficiently small ε. More exactly, there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that $Q'_\varepsilon|_\sigma > c$ or $Q'_\varepsilon|_\sigma < c^{-1}$. Then either Q_ε or Q_ε^{-1} is a contracting map of a segment and it possesses an unique hyperbolic fixed point.

Therefore the closed trajectory intersecting ω_i^a for $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ and ω_i^b for $i = 1, \dots, n$ is an attracting or repelling limit cycle depending on parity of index i. Moreover, due to Lemma 2 there is no other closed trajectories. (The same proof literally repeats for the segment $[a_{2n+1}, b_{2n+1}]$.)

So function f satisfies all the assertions of Theorem A and main result is proved modulo Lemma 1 and Lemma 4.

□

5 Proof of approximations of the Poincaré map

5.1 Asymptotics

In this section we provide a rigorous proof of Lemma 1. See the statement and the heuristic proof in section 3.3.

Proof. The proof goes in 3 steps.

Step 1. *No too early releases.* First we show that the trajectory ψ with the initial condition $\psi(y_0) = 0$ cannot dettach from the grand canard at some fixed point to the left of $\beta(y_0)$.

Indeed, consider arbitrary point $\beta_1 \in (\widetilde{\alpha}^-, \beta(y_0))$. Due to the definition of the map β (see (5)) and the monotonicity of $\Phi^+[y_1, y_2\rangle$ with respect to y_2, the following estimate holds:

$$\Phi^-[y_0, 1\rangle + \Phi^+[-1, \beta_1\rangle < 0. \tag{17}$$

Consider a vertical segment $J_0 = \{y_0\} \times (x_1, x_2)$ that intersects M^- and Σ_- but does not intersect M^+. The trajectory ψ intersects J_0. Let the segments of grand canard in the basic strip be given by functions $x_+^{gc}(y)$ (for the part near M^+) and $x_-^{gc}(y)$ (for the part near M^-). It follows from the geometric singular perturbation theory [4] that outside of some neighbourhood of the jump points,

$$x_\pm^{gc}(y) = M^\pm(y) + O(\varepsilon).$$

Therefore, the grand canard intersects J_0 at the point $x_-^{gc}(y_0) < 0$. Let

$$J_0' = P_\varepsilon^{[y_0, \pi\rangle}([x_-^{gc}(y_0), 0]).$$

It follows from Theorem 3 that

$$|J_0'| \le C_1 e^{\frac{\Phi^-[y_0, \pi\rangle + o(1)}{\varepsilon}}, \tag{18}$$

for some constant C_1.

Consider now arbitrary fixed vertical segment $J_1 = \{\beta_1\} \times (x_1', x_2')$ that intersects M^+ and does not intersect M^-. As previously, the grand canard intersects J_1 in some point $x_+^{gc}(\beta_1)$ for ε small enough. We will prove that the trajectory ψ intersects J_1 as well. Let

$$J_1' = P_\varepsilon^{\langle -\pi, \beta_1]}([x_+^{gc}(\beta_1), x_2']).$$

It follows from Theorem 3 that

$$|J_1'| \ge C_2 e^{\frac{\Phi^+[-1, \beta_1\rangle + o(1)}{\varepsilon}} \tag{19}$$

The lower borders of the segments J_0' and J_1' coincide: it's the point of the intersection of the grand canard and the cross-section $\{y = \pm\pi\}$. It follows from (17), (18) and (19) that $|J_1'| \gg |J_0'|$ and therefore $J_0' \subset J_1'$. As trajectory ψ intersects J_0' it therefore intersects J_1' and J_1.

Step 2. *No too late releases.* Prove that $Q_\varepsilon^-(y_0)$ exists and moreover $Q_\varepsilon^-(y_0) < \beta_2$ for any fixed $\beta_2 \in (\beta(y_0), \widetilde{\alpha}^+)$ and sufficiently small ε. On the previous step we proved that the trajectory ψ intersects vertical segment J_2 to the left of $\beta(y_0)$. Now consider a segment $J_3 = \{\beta_2\} \times (0, \pi)$ to the right of $\beta(y_0)$. Then the trajectory ψ does not intersect J_3. This can be proved by application of the previous step to the system with the time reversed.

Now consider a region bounded by the circles $y = \beta_1$, $y = \beta_2$, the grand canard $x = x_+^{gc}(y)$ and the segment Σ^+. The trajectory ψ enters this region in some point of the segment J_1. As y monotonically increase, it has to leave the region. It cannot intersect $y = \beta_2$ and the grand canard. Therefore, it intersects Σ^+ in some point $(Q^+(y_0), \pi)$.

Step 3. *Asymptotics of* $Q^-(y_0)$. Assume that $Q^-(y_0)$ is defined. Let

$$R_\varepsilon^2 = P_\varepsilon^{[-\pi, Q^-(y_0)\rangle} \circ P_\varepsilon^{[y_0, \pi\rangle}.$$

Then

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon^2(0) - R_\varepsilon^2(x_-^{gc}(y_0)}{0 - x_-^{gc}(y_0)} = \frac{\pi - M^+(y_0) + O(\varepsilon)}{0 - M^-(y_0) + O(\varepsilon)}.$$

Due to Mean Value Theorem, it follows that the derivative of R_ε at some point x^* have to be of order constant. However Theorem 3 and the chain rule imply that

$$\log(R_\varepsilon^2)'_x = \frac{\Phi^+[y_0, 1\rangle + \Phi^-[-1, Q^-(y_0)\rangle + O(\varepsilon^\nu)}{\varepsilon}. \tag{20}$$

The right-hand side of (20) is bounded away from zero and infinity if the following estimate holds:

$$\Phi^+[y_0, 1\rangle + \Phi^-[-1, Q^-(y_0)\rangle = O(\varepsilon^\nu).$$

which differs from equation (5) only on $O(\varepsilon^\nu)$. Inverse Function Theorem finishes the proof. □

5.2 Estimate of the derivative

In this section we prove Lemma 4.

Denote the coordinates on $\Sigma^\pm$ as $y_\pm$. The Poincaré map Q_ε will be decomposed in the following way:

$$Q_\varepsilon \colon y_-^{(1)} \mapsto y_+^{(2)} \mapsto y_-^{(3)}. \tag{21}$$

Consider trajectory that intersects Σ_- at the point $y_-^{(1)}$, after that Σ_+ at the point $y_+^{(2)}$, after that Σ_- at the point $y_-^{(3)}$. Instead of the statement of Lemma 4 given above we will prove the following estimates:

$$(Q_\varepsilon^-)' = \frac{f'_x(x_-^{gc}(y_-^{(1)}), y_-^{(1)})}{f'_x(x_+^{gc}(y_+^{(2)}), y_+^{(2)})} \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon))$$

$$(Q_\varepsilon^+)' = \frac{f'_x(x_-^{gc}(y_+^{(2)}), y_+^{(2)})}{f'_x(x_+^{gc}(y_-^{(3)}), y_-^{(3)})} \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon))$$

Due to decomposition (21) and assertion 4 of Lemma 2 it implies Lemma 4.

Introduce some notation. Fix parameter $\varepsilon \in R_n$ such that grand canard exists. Fix the corresponding grand canard. Consider its part which is bounded by the intersections with J^+ and J^-. It can be described as double-valued function $y \mapsto x$. Denote it as $x = x^{gc}(y)$. We will also use the notation $x = x_+^{gc}(y)$ and $x = x_-^{gc}(y)$ in the neighborhood of M^+ and M^- respectively.

Recall Theorem 3 from [1] and equation (3.5) from [3]:

Theorem 4. *Family* (1) *for small* $\varepsilon > 0$ *in the neighborhood of the slow curve (and outside any small fixed neighborhood of jump points) is smoothly orbitally equivalent to the family*

$$\dot{x} = f'_x(s(y,\varepsilon), y, \varepsilon),\ \dot{y} = \varepsilon.$$

Due to [3] the function $x = s(y,\varepsilon)$ above represents the true slow curve; it is defined in non-unique way but all true slow curves are exponentially close to each other and one can pick arbitrary one. We choose segments of the grand canard bounded away from the jump points as this true slow curve, so put $s(y,\varepsilon) = x_\pm^{gc}(y,\varepsilon)$. Below we will omit ε in $x_\pm^{gc}(y,\varepsilon)$ for brevity. In Theorem 4 take the neighborhood of the jump points sufficiently small such that $M^\pm(a_0)$ and $M^\pm(b_{-1})$ are strictly inside the linearized area. Consider two vertical transversal segments $\hat{J}^\pm$ which intersects M^+ and M^- respectively in the neighbourhood of the jump points and inside the linearized area. Denote their y-coordinates as $\hat{\alpha}^+$ and $\hat{\alpha}^-$, $\hat{\alpha}^\pm = \alpha^\pm(\varepsilon)$.

Proposition 5. *One can take parameters* $\hat{\alpha}^\pm(\varepsilon)$ *such that* $\hat{\alpha}^+ < a_0$, $b_{-1} < \hat{\alpha}^-$ *and the following equality takes place*

$$\int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy = 0. \tag{22}$$

Proof of Proposition 5. Function $\Phi^\pm[A, B\rangle = \int_A^B \lambda^\pm(M^\pm(y), y)$ is continuous and monotonic in A, B and tends to zero as B tends to A.

Take any y close to -1, $-1 < y < a_0$. Take any $\hat{\alpha}^-$ close to 1 such that $b_{-1} < \hat{\alpha}^- < 1$ and $\Phi^+[-1, y\rangle > |\Phi^-[\hat{\alpha}^-, 1\rangle|$. Because of continuity there exists function $\hat{\alpha}_0^+ = \hat{\alpha}_0^+(\hat{\alpha}^-) < y$ such that $\Phi^+[-1, \hat{\alpha}_0^+\rangle = |\Phi^-[\hat{\alpha}^-, 1\rangle|$. Therefore due to eqution in variations and Theorem 3

$$\int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}_0^+} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy = \varepsilon \cdot \log\left(P_\varepsilon^{[\hat{\alpha}_0^-, \hat{\alpha}_0^+\rangle}\right)'_x = O(\varepsilon^\nu),\ \nu \in (0,1) \tag{23}$$

Consider an interval $\hat{U}$ in the domain of $\hat{\alpha}^-$. Consider sufficiently small $\hat{\delta}$ such that for every $\hat{\alpha}^-$ from that interval $\hat{\delta}$-neighborhood $U_{\hat{\delta}}(\hat{\alpha}_0^+) \subset (-1, a_0)$. Take linearized area large enough to satisfy the following assertions: it should contain $\hat{U}$ and contain $U_{\hat{\delta}}(\hat{\alpha}_0^+)$ for every $\hat{\alpha}^- \in \hat{U}$. The derivative f'_x inside the linearized area is bounded away from zero. Therefore there exists constant $\hat{c}$ such that the following takes place as $\varepsilon \to 0$:

$$\max\left(\int_{\hat{\alpha}_0^+}^{\hat{\alpha}_0^+ + \hat{\delta}} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy,\ \int_{\hat{\alpha}_0^+ - \hat{\delta}}^{\hat{\alpha}_0^+} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy\right) > \hat{c}. \tag{24}$$

Therefore there exists $\hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{\varepsilon}(\hat{\delta}) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\varepsilon})$ the left-hand side of (23) is smaller than $\hat{c}$.

So for $\varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\varepsilon})$ there exists function $\hat{\alpha}^+ = \hat{\alpha}^+(\hat{\alpha}^-)$ such that $\hat{\alpha}^+ \in U_{\hat{\delta}}(\alpha_0^+)$ and the following equality takes place:

$$\int\limits_{\hat{\alpha}_0^+}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy = -\int\limits_{\hat{\alpha}_0^-}^{\hat{\alpha}_0^+} f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon)dy, \tag{25}$$

therefore equation (22) takes place. Due to construction $\hat{\alpha}^+$ satisfies all assertions of Proposition 5. □

Denote by $\eta_\pm$ the vertical component of the linearizing charts in the neighborhood of $M^\pm$ respectively. Moreover, due to the choice of $s(y, \varepsilon)$ in Theorem 4, grand canard $x^{gc}(y)$ is given by the equation $\eta_\pm = 0$ in the neighborhood of $M^\pm$. Take small constant c and let $\xi_\pm$ be y-coordinate on the $\{\eta_\pm = c\}$. Decompose Q_ε^- as

$$Q_\varepsilon^- \colon \Sigma^- \to \{\eta_- = c\} \to \hat{J}^- \to \hat{J}^+ \to \{\eta_+ = c\} \ \to \Sigma^+,$$
$$Q_\varepsilon^- \colon y_- \mapsto \xi_- \mapsto \eta_- \mapsto \eta_+ \mapsto \xi_+ \mapsto y_+.$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Below we prove only the first equation from the statement of Lemma 4. Proof for the second and the third ones is similar.

We have to estimate the derivative

$$Q_\varepsilon^{-\prime} = \frac{dy_+}{dy_-} = \frac{dy_+}{d\xi_+} \cdot \frac{d\xi_+}{d\eta_+} \cdot \frac{d\eta_+}{d\eta_-} \cdot \frac{d\eta_-}{d\xi_-} \cdot \frac{d\xi_-}{dy_-}. \tag{26}$$

Constant c in the definition of the transversal $\{\eta_\pm = c\}$ does not depend on ε and the trajectory spends bounded time between the intersections with $\Sigma^\pm$ and $\{\eta_\pm = c\}$, therefore

$$\xi_\pm(y_\pm) = y_\pm + \varepsilon K_\pm(\varepsilon, y_\pm), \ K_\pm \text{ is smooth.} \tag{27}$$

Denote

$$\Phi_\varepsilon^\pm[A, B\rangle = \int_A^B f'_x(x_\pm^{gc}(y), y).$$

Charts $(\eta_\pm, \xi_\pm)$ are linearized, therefore due to Theorem 4 the following takes place:

$$\eta_-(\xi_-) = c \exp \frac{\Phi_\varepsilon^-[\xi_-, \hat{\alpha}^-\rangle}{\varepsilon}, \ \eta_+(\xi_+) = c \exp\left(-\frac{\Phi_\varepsilon^+[\hat{\alpha}^+, \xi_+\rangle}{\varepsilon}\right) \tag{28}$$

Calculate the derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\eta_-}{d\xi_-} &= -\frac{c}{\varepsilon} f'^-_x(x_-^{gc}(\xi_-), \xi_-) \exp \frac{\Phi_\varepsilon^-[\xi_-, \hat{\alpha}^-\rangle}{\varepsilon}, \\ \frac{d\eta_+}{d\xi_+} &= -\frac{c}{\varepsilon} f'^+_x(x_+^{gc}(\xi_+), \xi_+) \exp\left(-\frac{\Phi_\varepsilon^+[\hat{\alpha}^+, \xi_+\rangle}{\varepsilon}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Below we omit $\xi_\pm$ in the argument of the $x_\pm^{gc}$ for brevity.



Figure 5: Coordinates in Lemma 4

Now estimate the factors in the decomposition (26) for some trajectory $x(y)$ using (27) and (29) :

$$Q_\varepsilon^{-\prime} = \frac{1+\varepsilon K_-}{1+\varepsilon K_+} \cdot \frac{f_x'^-(x_-^{gc},\xi_-)}{f_x'^+(x_+^{gc},\xi_+)} \cdot \exp\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_\varepsilon^-[\xi_-,\hat\alpha^-\rangle + \Phi_\varepsilon^+[\hat\alpha^+,\xi_+\rangle\right) \cdot \frac{d\eta_+}{d\eta_-} \tag{30}$$

Estimate the last factor:

$$\left.\frac{d\eta_+}{d\eta_-}\right|_{(x(y),y)} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{\hat\alpha^-}^{\hat\alpha^+} f_x'(x(y),y,\varepsilon)dy\right) \tag{31}$$

Consider integral in the argument of exp-function. By construction the trajectory $x(y)$ intersects $\{\eta_- = c\}$ at point ξ_- inside segment $[a_0,b_0]$, and $\xi_- < \hat\alpha^-$. Due to Theorem 3 for any $y \in [1,-1\rangle$ the following approximations take place:

$$\left(P_\varepsilon^{[\xi_-,y\rangle}\right)_x' = \exp\frac{\Phi^-([\xi_-,1]) + O(\varepsilon^\nu)}{\varepsilon}, \tag{32}$$

$$\left(P_\varepsilon^{[y,\hat\alpha^+\rangle}\right)_x' = \exp\left(\frac{\Phi^+([-1,\hat\alpha^+]) + O(\varepsilon^\nu)}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Due to the definition of $\hat{\alpha}^{\pm}$ the following holds: there exists constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\Phi^-([\xi_-, \hat{\alpha}^-]) + \Phi^-([\hat{\alpha}^-, 1]) + \Phi^+([-1, \hat{\alpha}^+]) < -M. \tag{33}$$

Therefore for any $y \in (\hat{\alpha}^-, \hat{\alpha}^+)$ the following estimate takes place:

$$x(y) - x^{gc}(y) < \exp\left(-\frac{M}{\varepsilon}\right), \ M{=}\text{const}$$

Indeed, for $y \in (\xi_-, 1)$ it follows from (32) and for $y \in (1, \alpha^+)$ it follows from (33). Further,

$$\int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} (f'_x(x(y), y, \varepsilon) - f'_x(x^{gc}(y), y, \varepsilon))\, dy < \int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} \int_0^{\exp\left(-\frac{M}{\varepsilon}\right)} f''_{xx} dx dy = o(\varepsilon). \tag{34}$$

Due to Proposition 5 the left-hand side of the inequality (34) equals $\int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} f'_x(x(y), y, \varepsilon) dy$. Therefore due to (31) the following estimate takes place

$$\left.\frac{d\eta_+}{d\eta_-}\right|_{(x(y),y)} = 1 + o(1).$$

Now estimate the factor with exp-function in (30):

$$\exp \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\Phi^-_\varepsilon[\xi_-, \hat{\alpha}^-\rangle + \Phi^+_\varepsilon[\hat{\alpha}^+, \xi_+\rangle\right) \tag{35}$$

We use the following obvious statement:

Proposition 6. *Let trajectory $x(y)$ passes through points (ξ_-, c) and (ξ_+, c). Then there exists trajectory $x^*(y)$ such that*

$$\int_{\xi_-}^{\xi_+} f'_x(x^*(y), y, \varepsilon) dy = 0. \tag{36}$$

Proof of the Proposition 6. Grand canard passes through $(\xi_-, 0)$ and $(\xi_+, 0)$. Therefore by Mean Value Theorem for Poincaré map from the segment $[(\xi_-, 0), (\xi_-, c)]$ to the segments $[(\xi_+, 0), (\xi_+, c)]$ there exists a trajectory $x^*(y)$ with the derivative of the Poincaré map equals to 1. Equation in variations implies (36). □

Let us decompose (36) in the sum of three integrals:

$$\int_{\xi_-}^{\xi_+} f'_x(x^*(y), y, \varepsilon) dy = \int_{\xi_-}^{\hat{\alpha}^-} + \int_{\hat{\alpha}^-}^{\hat{\alpha}^+} + \int_{\hat{\alpha}^+}^{\xi_+} = 0.$$

Literally as in (34) the second integral has an order $o(\varepsilon)$. Charts in the neighbourhood of the slow curve are linearized so one can replace $x^*(y)$ by $x^{gc}(y)$. So the following takes place

$$\int_{\xi_-}^{\hat{\alpha}^-} f'^-_x(x^{gc}_-, y) dy + o(\varepsilon) + \int_{\hat{\alpha}^+}^{\xi_+} f'^+_x(x^{gc}_+, y) dy = 0$$

therefore the sum of integrals in (35) has an order of $o(\varepsilon)$. Therefore the third factor has an order $\exp(\frac{o(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}) = 1 + o(1)$. Derivative f'_x is smooth therefore due to (27) the following takes place: $f'_x(x^{gc}_{\pm}(y_{\pm}), y_{\pm}) = f'_x(x^{gc}_{\pm}(\xi_{\pm}), \xi_{\pm}) + O(\varepsilon)$. Finally

$$\frac{dy_+}{dy_-} = \frac{f'_x(x^{gc}_-, y_-)}{f'_x(x^{gc}_+, y_+)} \cdot (1 + o(1)) \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon)).$$

□

6 Conjectures on unconnected slow curves

Previously, only the case of connected slow curve was studied. We believe that the methods of the present paper can be applied also to the case of unconnected slow curve. In this section we propose a related conjecture and outline its proof.

Consider system (1) on the two-torus with the slow curve M that satisfies the following properties:

1. Curve M has two connected components M_1 and M_2. Projection of M on the y-axis along x-axis is two disjoint arcs.
2. Each of the components M_1, M_2 has two jump points $G^{\pm}_1$ and $G^{\pm}_2$.
3. Components M_1, M_2 are nondegenerate in the sense of Definition 3.

We will call such slow curve *simple unconnected*. One can state the following conjecture

Conjecture 1. *For every desired number $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a local topologically generic set in the space of slow-fast systems on the two-torus with the following property:*

1. *Slow curve is nondegenerate and simple unconnected.*
2. *For every system from this set there exists a sequence of intervals $\{R_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subset \{\varepsilon > 0\}$, accumulating at zero, such that for every $\varepsilon \in R_n$ there exists at least l canard limit cycles, which makes one pass along the slow direction.*

Components of the simple unconnected slow curve may be both contractible or both noncontractible, see Figure 6. Consider first the case of contractible ones, see Figure 6, top. Note that this figure is very similar to one studied in the present paper (see Figure 1) but contains two copies of the slow curve. In fact one can obtain such picture as a two-leaf cover of the original system (1): the fundamental domain should be extended twice along the slow direction. If we obtain the new system from the original one in this way all the results about two-pass limit cycles for the original system can be rewritten in terms of one-pass limit cycles for the new system. This is not a huge success because of strong nongenericity of the new system (shift symmetry). However, it is easy to see that the only requirement that needed for our proof to work in the new settings is the existence of two grand canards for the same value of ε. For shift-symmetric system we obtain them "for free", for generic system it seem to be much rarer event. Nevertheless, if the generic system possesses two grand canards like is



Figure 6: Simple unconnected slow curve: contractible (top) and noncontractivle (bottom) cases

shown on the Figure, the same arguments we used to prove Theorem A can be applied verbatim to the proof of Conjecture 1.

We also note that the same arguments work for the case of noncontractible components, again, provided that two grand canards exists. This can be of particular interest because slow-fast systems with noncontractible slow curve (like in Figure 6, bottom), appear naturally in physical applications [5].

Thus the key question is: can two grand canards coexist for the same value of ε for generic system? We conjecture that for *topologically generic* systems the answer is affirmative.

Conjecture 2. *For* locally topologically generic *slow-fast system on the two-torus there exists a sequence of intervals on the ray* $\{\varepsilon > 0\}$ *accumulating at 0 such that for every* ε *from these intervals there exists two grand canards.*

Outline of the proof. Each component M_1, M_2 has repelling and attracting parts. Denote them as $M_1^\pm$ and $M_2^\pm$ respectively. Take $\alpha_1^\pm$ close to $y(G_1^\pm)$, $\alpha_1^\pm \in \big(y(G_1^+), y(G_1^-)\big)$ and $\alpha_2^\pm$ close to $y(G_2^\pm)$, $\alpha_2^\pm \in \big(y(G_2^+), y(G_2^-)\big)$. As before (see section 3.1) consider corresponding vertical transversal segments $J_1^\pm$, $J_2^\pm$ with the following properties: for $i = 1, 2$ segment $J_i^\pm$ intersects $M_i^\pm$ respectively

and does not intersect $M_i^{\mp}$; moreover,

$$y(J_i^{\pm}) = \alpha_i^{\pm},\ i = 1, 2.$$

Denote $y_1 = (y(G_1^-) + y(G_2^+))/2$, $y_2 = (y(G_2^-) + y(G_1^+))/2$ and consider vertical global transversal circles $y_1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ and $y_2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$. As before (see section 3.2) denote

$$D_{1,\varepsilon}^+ = P_\varepsilon^{[\alpha_1^+, y_1\rangle} J_1^+,\ D_{1,\varepsilon}^- = P_\varepsilon^{\langle y_2, \alpha_1^-]} J_1^-,$$

$$D_{2,\varepsilon}^+ = P_\varepsilon^{[\alpha_2^+, y_2\rangle} J_2^+,\ D_{2,\varepsilon}^- = P_\varepsilon^{\langle y_1, \alpha_2^-]} J_2^-.$$

If intersection $D_{1,\varepsilon}^+ \cap D_{2,\varepsilon}^-$ is not empty, than there exists grand canard which intersects both J_1^+ and J_2^-. The same holds for intersection $D_{1,\varepsilon}^- \cap D_{2,\varepsilon}^+$ and grand canard which intersects both J_1^- and J_2^+.

Further, these intersections forms a series of segments accumulating at zero.

$$\mathcal{R}^1 = \{R_n^1\}_{n=0}^\infty, \quad \mathcal{R}^2 = \{R_n^2\}_{n=0}^\infty$$

$$\bigcup_{n=0}^\infty R_n^1 = \{\varepsilon \mid D_{1,\varepsilon}^+ \cap D_{2,\varepsilon}^- \neq \emptyset\}, \quad \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty R_n^2 = \{\varepsilon \mid D_{1,\varepsilon}^- \cap D_{2,\varepsilon}^+ \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Definition 6. System (1) is called *good* if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $R_n^1 \cap R_m^2 \neq \emptyset$ and $R_n^1,\ R_m^2 \subset (0, \varepsilon)$. Otherwise call system *bad*.

We conjecture that *good* systems are topologically generic in the space of slow-fast systems[1]. Indeed, for a couple of intervals R_k^1 and R_l^2 one can perturb system slightly (increasing or decreasing the fast component of the vector field in the "rotation phase") to make them intersect each other by a segment. If k and l are large enough the perturbation is small enough. Therefore, the set of systems with one intersection between $\mathcal{R}^1$ and $\mathcal{R}^2$ is open and dense. In a similar way one can show that the set of systems with any finite number of intersections between these two series of segments is open and dense. It follows that the set of systems with *infinitely many* intesections is residual and the corresponding property is topologically generic. □

References

[1] J. Guckenheimer, Yu. S. Ilyashenko, *The Duck and the Devil: Canards on the Staircase*, Moscow Math. J., Volume 1, Number 1, 2001, pp. 27–47.

[2] I. Schurov. *Ducks on the torus: existence and uniqueness.* J. of Dynamical and Control Systems. **16**:2 (2010), 267–300. See also: arXiv:0910.1888v1.

[3] I. V. Shchurov. *Canard cycles in generic fast-slow systems on the torus.* Transactions of the Moscow Mathematical Society, 2010, 175-207

[4] N. Fenichel, *Geometric singular perturbation theory for ordinary differential equations*, J. of Diff. Eq., 31 (1979), pp. 53–98.

[1] The authors are grateful to Victor Kleptsyn for these arguments.

[5] Kleptsyn V. A, Romaskevich O. L., Schurov I. V. Josephson effect and slow-fast systems. Nanostructures. Mathematical Physics and Modelling. **8**:1 (2013), pp. 31–46 (in Russian). See also arXiv:1305.6755.

[6] E. F. Mishchenko and N. Kh. Rozov, Differential equations with small parameters and relaxation oscillations. Plenum Press, 1980.

[7] M. Krupa, P. Szmolyan, Extending geometric singular perturbation theory to nonhyperbolic points — fold and canard points in two dimensions, SIAM J. Math. Anal., Vol 33, No 2, pp. 286–314.